

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 16 2007

-5-

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action of November 17, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 3-14 are requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Amemiya (US 2002/0077548; US 6,669,634).

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Amemiya in view of Soderberg (US 2004/0186357).

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The References of Record

Amemiya discloses a portable imaging apparatus which includes a computer body 200 with keyboard 212 to which a display panel 300 is mounted via a hinge 400 analogous to a standard laptop computer. The portable unit 100 is received in a support apparatus 500 which includes a power supply, CPU, main memory, external memory, and other conventional computer hardware.

As noted in the abstract, Amemiya emphasizes the portability of the apparatus 100. Such portability would be defeated if Amemiya were attached to a stand.

Soderberg fails to provide any motivation which would motivate one to de-portablize the portable workstation of Amemiya.

The Claims Distinguish Patentably Over The References of Record

Claims 3 and 4 have been placed in independent form, but not otherwise amended or further limited.

Claim 3 calls for a bracket, a first hinge at a first end of the bracket and a second hinge at the second end of the bracket distal from the first. The first hinge is connected between the bracket and the case; whereas, the second hinge is connected between the bracket and the display device. By contrast, Amemiya has a single hinge 400 which is connected with both the case and the display device. Amemiya does not

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 16 2007

-6-

disclose a second hinge or a bracket mounted between the two hinges. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 3** is not anticipated by Amemiya.

Claim 4 calls for a keyboard hingeably coupled to the case. In Amemiya, there is no suggestion that the keyboard **212** is hingedly connected to the case **200**. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 4** is not anticipated by Amemiya.

Claim 7 calls for the case and the display device to have three different positions: a stowed position, a fully-extended position, and a lower position. By contrast, the hinge **400** of Amemiya enables the display panel **300** to move between only open (Fig. 1) and closed (Fig. 2) positions. Moreover, Amemiya provides no motivation to move the display panel to other positions, much less provides an enabling disclosure as to how to design an appropriate mechanical assembly which would enable such movement to take place. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 7** distinguishes patentably and unobviously over Amemiya.

Claims 5, 6, and 8-14 depend from claim 7 and are patentable for the reasons set forth above and others.


CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 3-14 distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record. An early allowance of all claims is requested.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is requested to telephone Thomas Kocovsky at (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP



Thomas E. Kocovsky, Jr.
Reg. No. 28,383
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

LAHMMDATA\2006\MAKO200030.AMN.DOC